UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/922,178	08/02/2001	Craig Lewis	15828-160001	7529

26231 7590 09/13/2007

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
P.O. BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, MINH DIEU T	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2137	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/13/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/922,178	LEWIS, CRAIG	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Minh Dieu Nguyen	2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 June 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to the communication dated 6/29/2007 with the amendments to claims 1, 13 and 24.

2. Claims 1-30 are pending.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 6/29 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Applicant argues that the combination of Ryu and Arnold fails to teach displaying the coded password to the user of the computer system prior to the user knowing the password. The Examiner respectfully disagrees, Ryu discloses the password encryption is displayed at the computer monitor in an alphanumeric form. The encrypted password is referred to the manufacturer's service center, where the encrypted password can be decoded and the recovered password is sent back to the user (Ryu: col. 2, lines 36-42). It is understood that the user can only view the coded password but not the password itself and not until it is decoded and sent back to the user.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101 have been withdrawn based on the filed amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 4-5, 9-10, 12-13, 16-17, 21, 23-26 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Ryu (6,067,625) in view of Arnold et al. (6,601,175).

a) As to claims 1, 13 and 24, Ryu discloses a method for maintaining a password in a computer system with an operating system for running a dedicated application, comprising: providing the generated password to an operating system security module (i.e. it is understood that the password is provided to a system for encryption, Ryu: col. 3, lines 54-55); producing a coded password as a function of the generated password, wherein the generated password can be determined by decoding the coded password (i.e. encrypting the password stored in the CMOS or non-volatile memory, and the encrypted password can be decoded, see Ryu: col. 2, lines 35-36 and lines 40-41); displaying the coded password to the user of the computer system prior to the user knowing the password (see Ryu: col. 2, lines 34-37), wherein the user can receive the generated password by providing the coded password to a remote password provider (see Ryu: col. 2, lines 38-42); and storing the coded password for use in connection with a secure operating system (i.e. it is inherently understood that

the code password is stored in order to get displayed to a user of the computer system, as addressed above).

However Ryu is silent on the teaching of generating a password in response to an occurrence of a prescribed password generation event associated with a user, wherein the password is unknown to the user.

Arnold is relied on for the teaching of generating a password in response to an occurrence of a prescribed password generation event associated with a user, wherein the password is unknown to the user (i.e. generating a control password, Arnold: col. 4, line 43). Arnold also discloses storing the password for use in connection with a secure operating system login access (see Arnold: col. 7, line 56 to col. 8, line 9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the use of generating a password in response to an occurrence of a prescribed password generation event associated with a user, wherein the password is unknown to the user in the system of Ryu, as Arnold teaches, so as to provide password protection for data processing systems (see Arnold: col. 1, lines 25-27).

b) As to claims 4, 16 and 25, please see addressed above claim 1

c) As to claims 5, 17 and 26, the combination of Ryu and Arnold discloses the prescribed password generation event includes at least one selected from the group consisting of a computer system power up; a computer system re-boot; expiration of a prescribed time duration from an immediately preceding password generation event; restoration of a security level from a modified security level to a default security level,

and occurrence of a secure operating system login access (see Arnold: col. 8, lines 16-17).

d) As to claim 9, the combination of Ryu and Arnold discloses generating the password includes generating the password for a prescribed username (see Arnold: col. 3, lines 33-43).

e) As to claims 10, 21 and 29, the examiner takes official notice that the user accesses the system needs the username. The user is understood to mean a person (i.e. a service person, a repair person, an administration person) therefore username includes a service username.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the use of service username in the prescribed username so as to specifically generate and assign user account.

f) As to claims 12 and 23, the combination of Arnold and Ryu discloses the computer system includes at least one selected from the group consisting of a stand-alone computer system and a stand-alone network of computer systems (see Arnold: Fig.1).

7. Claims 2-3 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryu (6,067,625) in view of Arnold et al. (6,601,175) and further in view of Thompson et al. (6,725,382).

The combination of Ryu and Arnold discloses the method of claim 1, however it is silent on the teaching of overwriting a previously generated password or previously stored coded password.

Thompson is relied on for the teaching of a security mechanisms for thwarting theft or unauthorized access of devices and particularly to password mechanisms comprising overwriting any previous value of password (see Thompson: col. 6, lines 32-37).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the use of overwriting previous value of password as Thompson teaches in the system of Ryu and Arnold so as to maintain the updated password.

8. Claims 6, 18 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryu (6,067,625) in view of Arnold et al. (6,601,175) and further in view of Henn et al. (2004/0139349).

The combination of Ryu and Arnold discloses the method of claim 5, however it is silent on the teaching of the modified security level of a password generation event includes at least one selected from the group consisting of a change in the security level within the dedicated application, a security level override within the dedicated application, and a one-shot security access within the dedicated application.

Henn is relied on the teaching of having the modified security level of a password generation event includes at least one selected from the group consisting of a change in the security level within the dedicated application, a security level override within the

dedicated application, and a one-shot security access within the dedicated application (i.e. a change in the security level of a certain application without changing the application function to be accessed (see Henn: page 2, paragraph [0023]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the use of having the modified security level of a password generation event includes at least one selected from the group consisting of a change in the security level within the dedicated application, a security level override within the dedicated application, and a one-shot security access within the dedicated application as Henn teaches in the system of Ryu and Arnold so as to protect the security of the system.

9. Claims 7 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryu (6,067,625) in view of Arnold et al. (6,601,175) and further in view of Kidder et al. (2004/0031030).

The combination of Ryu and Arnold discloses the method of claim 1, however it is silent on the teaching of searching a username registry of the dedicated application upon the occurrence of the prescribed password generation event and removing any invalid usernames from the username registry.

Kidder is relied on for the teaching of searching a username registry of the dedicated application upon the occurrence of the prescribed password generation event (see Kidder: paragraph [0307], i.e. during login, the server searches the database for

matching username) and removing any invalid usernames from the username registry (see Kidder: paragraph [0324], i.e. if a rogue user is identified, the its profile is deleted).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the use of searching a username registry of the dedicated application upon the occurrence of the prescribed password generation event and removing any invalid usernames from the username registry in the system of Ryu and Arnold, as Kidder teaches so as to keep the registry up to date with valid information.

10. Claims 8, 20 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryu (6,067,625) in view of Arnold et al. (6,601,175) in view of Kidder et al. (2004/0031030) in view of IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin (NB9203306) and further in view of Swift (6,308, 274).

The combination of Ryu, Arnold and Kidder discloses the method of claim 7, however it is silent of the capability of reviewing privileges associated with respective valid usernames in the username registry and resetting the privileges of the respective valid username to prescribed default settings.

IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin (IBM-TDB) is relied on for the teaching of reviewing privileges associated with respective valid usernames in the username registry (i.e. examining, changing, deleting object definitions (e.g. privileges) required for a distributed security service, see IBM-TDB).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the use of reviewing privileges associated with respective valid

usernames in the username registry in the system of Ryu and Arnold as IBM-TDB teaches so as to provide a control to all security object for administration purposes (see IBM-TDB, first paragraph).

The combination of Ryu, Arnold and IBM-TDB discloses changing the security object (see IBM-TDB), however it is silent on the capability of resetting the privileges of the respective valid username to prescribed default settings.

Swift is relied on for the teaching of resetting the privileges of the respective valid username to prescribed default settings (i.e. a user may run a task with enhanced privileges, once the task is performed, the restricted privileges (e.g. system default) is restored, see Swift: col. 13, line 64 to col. 14, line 8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the use of resetting the privileges of the respective valid username to prescribed default settings in the system of Ryu, Arnold and IBM-TDB, as Swift teaches so as to conveniently change privilege levels or access rights.

11. Claims 11, 22 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryu (6,067,625) in view of Arnold et al. (6,601,175) and further in view of Warn (5,270,943).

The combination of Ryu and Arnold discloses the method of claim 1, however it is silent on the capability of having the dedicated application includes a point of sale application in a fuel dispensing environment.

Warn is relied on for the teaching of having a system for controlling fuel dispensers through a PC-based point of sale application software (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the use of point of sale application in a fuel dispensing as Warn teaches in the system of Ryu and Arnold so as to integrate pump control with other features (see Warn: Abstract).

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Minh Dieu Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3873.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on 571-272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

mdn
9/6/07

EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER